



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/588,807

08/07/2006

Alain Colin

6003.1075

2793

23280 7590 07/29/2008
Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 7th Avenue
14th Floor
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER

BANH, DAVID H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2854

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/588,807	Applicant(s) COLIN ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID BANH	Art Unit 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/07/2006 and 5/29/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 11-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Markham et al. (US Patent 6,215,119).

Markham et al. teaches an encoder (column 3, lines 50-55, **200**) for generating a periodic signal in response to the rotation of a rotary element (column 3, line 30, **100**) and further an evaluation unit (column 5, lines 15- 30, circuit, **800**) that is capable of generating a second signal having a resolution ratio (column 5, lines 60-65), a frequency ratio (column 5, lines 40-50) and a phase relation to the first signal (column 5, lines 5-15).

For claim 12: Markham et al. teaches that the evaluation unit adjusts the first and second signal by producing a signal that is half way in phase between the first and the second (column 5, lines 40-50).

For claim 13: Markham et al. teaches that the evaluation unit generates an output (column 5, lines 7, synthesizes a signal) that is used to drive a pulse controlled device (column 12, claim 21, controlling timing of device by corrected signal output).

For claim 16: Markham et al. teaches that the first and second signals are generated as a sequence of signal pulses (column 4, lines 1-3, **282**).

For claim 17: Markham et al. teaches that the rotary element is a codewheel (column 3, line 30, **100**), which is an 8mm shaft (column 3, line 33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markham et al. (US Patent 6,215,119) in view of Ecklemeyer (US Patent 4,271,379).

Markham et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 14 as found in claim 11. Markham et al. does not teach that the resolution of the second signal is lower than the resolution of the first signal. However, Ecklemeyer teaches a means of changing the resolution of a pulse signal for pulse trains carrying information about the speed and position of a motor (column 6, lines 18-45, claim 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the resolution changing means of Ecklemeyer with the invention taught by Markham et al. for the purpose of controlling the first and second signals of Markham et al. enabling the resolution of the output signal to be reduced to below the resolution of the incoming signals for the purpose of reducing the noise and random fluctuations that could be visible at higher resolutions.

For claim 15: The combination taught in claim 14 includes a divider (column 6, lines 18-45, speed adjusting means to adjust number of pulses per resolution) for reducing the resolution of the first signal.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markham et al. (US Patent 6,215,119) in view of Jackson et al. (US Patent 7,302,237). Markham et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 18 as found in parent claim 11 above. Markham et al. does not teach a further synthesizer for generating a further signal having a further resolution ratio, frequency ratio and phase relationship to the first signal. However, Jackson teaches a signal synthesizer that generates signals (column 6, lines 20-24, signal generator **10**), the signal having a frequency ratio (column 30-40, frequency as divide ratio) and a phase relation (column 2, lines 5-15, phase offset). Jackson does not discuss a resolution ratio, however, Ecklemeyer teaches a means for changing the resolution of a given signal (column 6, lines 18-45, claim 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Markham et al. with the signal generator of Jackson et al. and the resolution modifier of Ecklemeyer for the purpose of being able to produce an optimized synthesized signal that be used to control the position of a rotary element.

6. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markham et al. (US Patent 6,215,119) in view of Marmin (US Patent 5,232,367). For claim 19, Markham et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 19 as found in claim 11. Markham et al. does not teach that the rotary element is found in a folding apparatus of a rotary offset press. However, Marmin teaches a folding apparatus in a

Art Unit: 2854

rotary offset press (column 1, lines 5-10), including rotary elements (see Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rotary element taught by Markham et al. as the rotary element of a folding apparatus of a rotary offset press as its position is more accurately determinable and controlled.

For claim 20, the combination used to reject claim 19 teaches an offset press comprising at least one rotary element of the type recited in claim 11.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID BANH whose telephone number is (571)270-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30AM-8PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DHB
July 28, 2008

/Daniel J. Colilla/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854